



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

an artist. Architecture, as peculiarly the art-industry, ought to lead the great movement, and is doing it, and adding color to form in the structures that meet all uses and employ all manners of taste and labor.

The most elaborate essay in the volume seems to have been made from a series of criticisms on the Art Exposition at Munich in 1869, and in thirty-six pages it reviews the influence of these expositions upon the temper of artists and the spirit of their art. The critic allows that the combination of so many specimens of contemporary art awakens interest in fine work, gives a generous cosmopolitan tone to art, — a *humanity* much better than the *humanism* of the fourteenth and fifteenth century; and he rejoices in the realistic tendency that strives to put nature and life upon canvas and into marble, and cares more for manhood than for caste and creed. But he fears that pride of technic perfection is getting the better of inspiration, and that artists are tempted to vie with each other in startling effects for high prices before the eye of the great public, instead of studying Nature under the guidance of some devoted master, and courting ideal Beauty for her own sake, not for her golden dower. This whole essay is full of valuable suggestions and instructive criticisms.

-
12. — *Abhandlungen zur Kunstgeschichte als angewandter Aesthetik.* Von DR. HERMANN ULRICI, ordentl. Professor an der Universität zu Halle. Leipzig: T. D. Weigel. 1876.

Treatises upon Art History as Applied Aesthetics. 8vo. pp. 290.

DR. ULRICI has been most conspicuous of late by his elaborate works, "God and Nature" and "God and Man," which have probably been the strongest defence that has been made in our time by philosophical theism against materialism. Yet he began his public career in the interest of literature and art. His first noted work was a "History of Greek Poetic Art" (1835), which was followed in 1839 by his celebrated lectures upon "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art," which have been long familiar to English readers. It is not surprising, therefore, that he now returns to his first love, and that he celebrated his seventieth year by this instructive and interesting series of papers upon the history of art. The volume is divided into five parts, which relate respectively to the Contrast between Ancient and Modern Art; Style, as represented in the five epochs of Modern Architecture, the Byzantine, the Romanesque, the Gothic, the Renaissance, the Barocco; the Development of the Madonna Ideal in its chief Stages; the Characteristics of the Great

Masters of the Flourishing Time of Painting, Fra Angelico and Masaccio, Lionardo, Michel Angelo, Raphael, Titian, Correggio, Dürer; and finally to the Illustration of the Idea of the Drama in Shakespeare, Goethe, and Schiller.

It is enough for us now to give a specimen of the author's way of handling his subject by making an outline of his first essay upon the difference between Ancient and Modern Art, instead of trying to go over all the ground which he has travelled in his five sections. He begins by saying that when we pass from Homer to the Nibelungen, or from Virgil to Dante and Ariosto, or from Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides to Shakespeare, Calderon, Goethe, and Schiller, we have the feeling that another atmosphere moves about us, as if we entered a new world. The Greek and Roman music is quite different from our modern music. It makes little account of harmony; knows nothing of thorough-bass; and its instruments were chiefly various flutes and harps. It would seem at first sight, on the contrary, that in the plastic arts, where the universal laws of statics and mechanism prevail, and the forms of nature and man are essentially the same as in sculpture and painting, the difference between ancient and modern art must almost wholly disappear. Yet what a significant, deep distinction there is between a Greek temple and a Gothic dome, — between the Moses of Michel Angelo, or an Apostle's statue by Andrew Sansovini or Peter Fischer, and the Greek figures of a hero or a god, — between a picture of Raphael and all that we know of ancient painting! If we ask what the difference is, we reply that the ancient art is more plastic, the modern is more picturesque. If we seek the ground of this distinction, we find it not merely in the different forms of sculpture and painting, nor in the different materials — on the one hand, clay, wood, stone, brass, and on the other hand, canvas, the pencil, and color — that are used. The real distinction lies in the sphere of intellect, or in the different conceptions of the idea of beauty.

The mere copy of an external form is not art, but art begins with a feeling or thought which seeks to express itself in some material, and the material is as unsatisfactory without the mind as the mind is unsatisfactory without the material. The main thing is the true relation between subject and form, being and manifestation, soul and body. It is obvious that accordingly as one or the other of these elements dominates in a work of art, the form of the art varies. When the external element or the body prevails, sculpture is the favorite form; when the spiritual element, the soul, is commanding, painting is the best expression. Hence we can justly say that ancient art is plastic, and modern art is picturesque. Plastic art requires physical beauty that is capable

of being put into actual form. It requires such definiteness of subject that it can be presented in the three dimensions of matter ; it demands that repose should prevail over movement, and also that the universal type should prevail over individual peculiarity ; and the finer traits of personality should be secondary to the general proportion and the necessary laws of form. The picturesque, on the other hand, gives the lead to the ideal factor ; puts spirit above nature, soul above body ; brings out what is subjective, individual, characteristic, in such way as to make the personal, the individual, the essential object and aim ; whilst the universal type appears as the substratum, as means or model. This distinction is seen even in ancient and modern literature ; and ancient poetry is regulated by quantity, and modern poetry by accent ; and thus the plastic and the picturesque appear.

-
13. — *Grimm's Law : A Study, or Hints towards an Explanation of the so-called "Lautverschiebung." To which are added some Remarks on the Primitive Indo-European K, and several Appendices.* By T. LE MARCHANT DOUSE. London : Trübner & Co. Strassburg : Karl J. Trübner. 1876.

THIS book is, most of all, an attempt to erect into a law of speech some facts which have generally been thought of as occasional blunders. Cockneys regularly drop their *h*'s, but they sometimes throw in an extraordinary *h*. In the comic journals personages who talk about the 'air of the 'ead will also speak of the hair of the *hatmosphere*. The stage Yankee regularly drops the nasal of *ing*, but he will bring it in sometimes in the wrong place : "The capting is goin' to Bosting," he says. The same style of New-Yorker regularly drops his *r*'s, but occasionally gives us one where it is not needed. He says *doah* for *door*, but *lor* for *law*. The Cockney and the Charleston gentleman are reputed to use *v* for *w*, and *w* for *v* ; they say *winegar* for *vinegar*, but *vagon* for *wagon*. On these facts, as he sees them, Mr. Douse claims to establish laws of dissimilation, which he calls compensation when a single dialect is affected, and differentiation when two or more dialects are affected. When one tribe, or one class of people, in presence of another speaking the same language, gets to dropping their *h*'s, for example, two feelings arise, — one, that they ought to use more *h*'s than they do ; the other, that they are different from the other class. The resultant of these two feelings is that they put in *h*'s in places where the others do not. This is compensation. When two tribes or classes are in presence of each other, and one begins to use a new sound, a